


4 25

**BRIEF OF THE
PERIODICAL PUBLISHERS
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
POSTAL COMMISSION**

NOV. 26, 1906



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

BRIEF

Presented by Robert J. Collier, Esq.,
on behalf of the
Periodical Publishers' Association of America
before the

POSTAL COMMISSION

In Session at Washington, D. C.

Monday, November, 26, 1906

MR. COLLIER:—*Mr. Chairman and Members of the Postal Commission:*

I represent here to-day the Periodical Publishers' Association of America, an organization of whose character and history I should like to say a few words, if only to show you the spirit in which they approach the complex problem for which it is the duty of your commission to find a solution.

I regret that the Periodical Publishers of America have chosen so inexperienced a spokesman as myself, but if you will permit me to read the names of a few of the periodicals whose views I represent, you may be able to consider my argument less as an individual utterance and more as an authoritative statement from the magazine publishers of America, who reach every month over ten million subscribers and, counting three readers to each copy, probably thirty million readers.

I speak in the name of "Harper's Monthly," the periodical whose pages gave, for the first time, to thousands of Americans many of the masterpieces of Thackeray, of George Eliot, of Anthony Trollope, of Charles Reade, of Charles Dickens, of Thomas Hardy.

I speak also for the "North American Review," edited by Charles Eliot Norton, Edward Everett, James Russell Lowell, first publisher of much of the work of George Bancroft, Charles Francis Adams, John Fiske, Asa Gray, Prescott, Motley, Sumner, Parton, and Daniel Webster.

I speak in the name of "Scribner's," which gave to the world the unpublished letters of Thackeray, General Sheridan's "Reminiscences of the Franco-German War," Minister Washburn's "Reminiscences of the Siege and Commune of Paris"; the vastly important diaries of Gouverneur Morris; the autobiographical writings of McCullough, Wallack, Robert Louis Stevenson; new material concerning Scott, Madame de Staël, and Mendelssohn; new literature from such men as Walter Pater, Andrew Lang, Thomas Bailey Aldrich, and Bret Harte.

I speak for the "Century," through whose pages we first became acquainted with much of the most important material in all the history that has been written about our Civil War, and which nobly supported the dying art of wood engraving by publishing the work of its greatest living master, Timothy Cole.

I speak in the name of the "Atlantic Monthly," edited by Lowell, by Fields, by Howells, and by Aldrich, for many years the medium through which the public came to know the new writings of Emerson, of Bryant, of Oliver Wendell Holmes, of Longfellow, of Parkman, of Whittier, and in which appeared for the first time Julia Ward Howe's magnificent "Battle Hymn of the Republic."

I speak for "Harper's Weekly," whose long fight for the advance of civilization has been signalized by its power in the Civil War, by the editorship of George William Curtis, and by the tremendously effective "Tweed Ring" cartoons of Thomas Nast.

I speak for the "Saturday Evening Post," which, in the days when America had already shown, as if by instinct, her knowledge of the importance of an alert and daring press, was founded by one of America's highest geniuses, Benjamin Franklin.

I speak for the "Outlook," which to-day, under Lyman Abbott, as formerly under Henry Ward Beecher, speaks the sentiments of many thousands of the most serious and substantial citizens of the Republic.

And, finally, to cut short a list which might be as long as it is glorious, I speak for "McClure's," one of the newer periodicals—for a monthly which has rendered incalculable service in awakening an independent public opinion and developing a citizenship based on national rather than local interests.

These are only a few of the periodicals enrolled on our list of membership, but they happily exemplify the long and loyal service rendered to American literature by the members of this Association and their honorable fulfilment of the trust imposed on them by Congress.

When, therefore, in reading the minutes of your hearings in New York, I found such frequent references on the part of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. Madden, to "*special interests*," "*privileged classes*," "*private interests that rob the public in the name of public benevolence*," I could not but feel that the multiform abuses and vexations under which his department has labored for so many years have made him regard all publishers with a somewhat jaundiced eye.

To set the Periodical Publishers of America straight before

you, I must at the outset make clear that we do not come before this Commission as needy pensioners on the public bounty, frightened beneficiaries of a threatened subsidy; nor do we come here in the spirit of that injured altruist, Mr. Pecksniff, who complained of being misunderstood. We are neither robbers nor philanthropists.

We appear before this Commission to offer our hearty co-operation toward the mitigation of any abuses that may have hampered the administration of the Postal Department; to discuss frankly and temperately all questions of fact and to maintain firmly what we conceive to be our rights.

The days of the triumph of special privilege are coming to a close, and I should resent keenly the imputation that I am here in any sense as a spokesman for special privilege. I believe I speak for my fellow publishers when I say they resent being stigmatized, even inferentially, as "*robbers*" by Mr. Madden, and resent being held responsible for abuses which only the cowardice or complaisance of previous incumbents of the executive department of the Post Office has permitted, and which were as injurious to our business as they were detrimental to the interests of the Department.

Please do not understand this as a reflection on our worthy Third Assistant Postmaster-General, for, while reading the very voluminous report of your Commission's hearings in New York, I could not but be impressed by the sincerity and the straightforwardness of Mr. Madden's presentation of his subject. I think no fair-minded man could read his address without feeling that the abuses of which he complained were real abuses; that he was matched in an unequal combat; that he no sooner scotched one evil than another reared its head; and I could not fail to see in him the best type of public servant absorbed in his work, fighting for the efficiency of his Department.

In so far then as Mr. Madden's aim is the correction of these flagrant abuses so convincingly described by him, in so far as his aim is the safeguarding of the second-class privilege by rigid enforcement of the law upon all alike, thus far our Association is in hearty accord with him. We are prepared to go even further, and to admit that if it shall be proved to the satisfaction of the Commission that the abuses complained of are ineradicable

by a fearless and properly manned Postal Administration, a question arises as to the advisability of appointing a permanent Postal Commission to decide vexed questions, and should that expedient prove inadequate, we would be prepared to support an explicit strengthening of the statute against those evils that even rigid administration had been found unable to control. We do not concede for a moment, however, that Mr. Madden has adduced any arguments or demonstrated any facts to warrant this Commission in recommending a change in the rate now charged for second-class mail.

Before considering, however, the much broader question as to the necessity or wisdom of reversing the policy adopted by Congress toward newspapers and periodicals in the law of '79, let us take up the purely departmental difficulties which Mr. Madden has so clearly pointed out. Mr. Madden's thesis seems to be:

1. That there are abuses of the second-class privilege.
2. That these abuses have attained such formidable dimensions as to threaten the efficient administration of the Department.
3. That the resultant loss of revenue is not only a serious handicap to the Department, and a burden on the taxpayer not intended by Congress, but an obstacle which makes less probable the inauguration, even at a distant date, of many long-desired postal improvements and economies, such as the parcels post and one-cent letter postage.

How then, continues Mr. Madden, are we to remedy these conditions? Shall it be by strict executive construction, supported by test cases in the courts? Shall it be by increasing the working force of the Department and establishing an elaborate system of espionage upon publishers? Or shall it be by the enactment of a new statute, a "law with teeth in it," defining, beyond peradventure, what constitutes a newspaper, what a periodical? And, finally, shall that definition be based on purely physical characteristics, or shall it take into account those ideal distinctions originally contemplated by Congress?

The reply of the Periodical Publishers of America to these questions is this: That while the evils of which Mr. Madden complains are not of their creation, and they have always endeavored

to cooperate with him by religiously observing his regulations and by taking in good part his enforcement of occasionally inconvenient technicalities, they will not oppose a courageous enforcement of the law as it stands by executive construction or otherwise, provided it has the sanction of the courts; on the contrary, that they consider it the duty of every Postmaster-General to continue to the bitter end the campaign against those evasions of the law by pretended periodicals and newspapers that are only advertising pamphlets in disguise; that should all other means prove inadequate, they would not oppose the appointment of a permanent postal commission to pass upon applications for admission to the second-class rate, and to review, at stated intervals, the qualifications of every publication enjoying that privilege to retain it. They do not believe, until Mr. Madden has demonstrated that a rigorous enforcement of the present law, supported by frequent test cases in the courts, is inadequate to deal with the problem and insufficient to reduce the loss legitimately attributed to second-class matter, that the question of a new statute should be even discussed. Certainly the withdrawal of a privilege in force for a quarter of a century would broaden the question from one of mere departmental efficiency to one of vital public policy. But before entering on that phase of my argument, I should prefer to take up, categorically and briefly, the abuses enumerated by the Third Assistant Postmaster-General and indicate, as far as possible, the Association's attitude toward them and suggestions for their cure.

We have heard how the book abuse—namely, the so-called “serial library”—has been controlled; we know that return copies are no longer permitted to be mailed at the cent a pound rate, and we have learned what measures the Department has taken to prevent the inclusion in periodicals of wall or writing paper samples, even coupons affixed to advertisements being now construed as merchandise. With this substantial list of achievements to its credit, let us see what are the gravest abuses confronting the Department to-day.

1. Almost undoubtedly the main body of abuses comes under that class of publications described by Congress, when it denied admission to the second-class privilege of “*publications designed primarily for advertising purposes or for free circulation or*

circulation at nominal rates." I might remark right here that I believe there has been widespread misinterpretation of what the phrase "*primarily designed for advertising purposes*" meant at the time Congress framed the original law. But I shall reserve that point till we come to discuss the advertising abuse so called. In so far, however, as the phrase "*designed for advertising purposes*" is applied to-day, it is true in a good sense of every American periodical, for without advertising, or the revenue from advertising, no one of them could continue to give its readers the value it gives at present. Practically, we find that to-day the publications that are circulated free, or at a nominal price, are the ones that are designed for advertising purposes in an objectionable sense, and it is to find some method of repelling their insidious and repeated attempts to usurp a privilege expressly denied to them by Congress that we must now address ourselves. For obviously, in this respect at least, Mr. Madden and the periodical publishers are at one. Mr. Madden finds his Department burdened with the cost of carriage of tons of cheap mail order publications which are in reality advertising circulars, possessing no literary or informative value whatsoever, many of them, because of the thin paper on which they are printed and the few pages of which they are made up, costing more per pound to handle than magazines of the highest class. Honest publishers find themselves in competition, both as to circulation and advertising, with publications which enjoy the privileges without sharing the responsibilities of the second-class rate.

How, then, shall we abate this evil? It seems to me there are two practicable methods, though whether they would cover all cases I can not say.

1. *A test of price.* In other words, an arbitrary definition of what constitutes a nominal price. After surveying the field and discovering at what price the worst offenders were being offered, the Department might frame a regulation which would prescribe a minimum price for monthlies, say, of twenty-five cents or fifty cents a year, and for weeklies of fifty cents or a dollar a year. I do not know whether a move in this direction has not already been made, for I have a vague recollection of reading an announcement in "*Wilshire's Magazine*" to the effect that

owing to a tyrannical ruling of the Department, the publisher had been compelled to raise his price from ten cents to twenty-five cents a year. On the opposite page, however, he offered his subscribers a chance to recoup by purchasing stock in a gold mine for about five cents a share.

As against this ruling, it might be argued that it is conceivable for a publication of the highest merit to attain such an immense circulation as to decrease its original cost of production (letter-press, illustrations, salaries) to almost a negligible quantity; and if that same publication saw fit to give the public the benefit of say half of its advertising revenue through a reduction of price, an altogether praiseworthy object, it might be prohibited from doing so through the Department's ruling.

In this connection I might say that it has always been a pet theory of mine that once a publisher has established his periodical on a reasonably successful business basis he should consider the increased economies resulting from increased circulation in the light of a reinvestment fund for the benefit of his readers. As a publication grows in influence and prosperity; as the circulation by each increase lowers proportionately the initial cost or "make-up" cost per copy; as the increased volume of advertising adds to its revenue, the publisher has three courses open to him. If he be a conscientious citizen, who feels that the second-class privilege imposes a quasi-public obligation upon him, he either uses the increase of circulation to improve the *quality* of his periodical, without increasing the cost per copy, and the growth of advertising to increase its *quantity*, or he uses the saving from both sources to reduce his price to the public. His other alternative is to pocket his profits and go on his way rejoicing.

The other day Mr. Atkinson, the talented publisher of the "Farm Journal," was asked by a member of this Commission how the addition of one-half a cent a pound to the present rate would affect him, and the suggestion leaving him apparently undismayed, he was led gently on to the admission that even two cents a pound would not worry him. That reply of Mr. Atkinson discloses a fundamental difference, it seems to me, between the publisher who realizes his responsibilities to the public and

the publisher who fails to see that Congress in conferring a privilege has likewise imposed obligations.

To me, and I believe to most of the members of our Association, that difference of a cent a pound would mean setting back my program for the development of my paper several years; it would mean wiping out all the economies of much added circulation; it would mean that as the buyer, so to speak, whom 600,000 readers had commissioned to supply them with their reading, I would have many thousand dollars less a year to invest in illustrations, war correspondence, short stories, or what not for their benefit.

And that is one of the chief reasons to my mind why a raise of rate on second-class matter would fall most heavily on the publishers who were already living up to their ideal obligation and giving their readers all they could reasonably afford to give. Under a raise of rate they would face the alternative of breaking faith with their readers—a faith that they had been many years establishing—or going broke themselves.

But this has been a long digression, though perhaps it has made clear that a regulation providing for a minimum price, while doing much to simplify the meaning of the phrase “nominal price,” might prevent some publisher from reinvesting the saving due to increased circulation and advertising in the form of a reduction in price.

2. Probably more effective in controlling this abuse would be my second suggestion—that of limiting the pound rate in each class to a certain number of pieces. I hesitate to suggest what would be a fair number for newspapers, but, in my personal opinion, five copies to the pound for weeklies and two and a half for monthlies would exclude no periodical which is giving honest value to its subscribers. This suggestion has a double advantage, in that it applies a test of value to the publication and limits the number of pieces per pound the Department is compelled to handle, thus reducing the average cost of second-class mail as a whole. Here, again, it may be argued that we are applying a purely physical test, the weight of paper, to a publication whose influence it is difficult to measure by such a standard.

(Since writing that portion of my brief, I have learned that

there are various publications, of a scientific nature, carrying no advertising, which would be practically debarred from the mails by a ruling with respect to the maximum number of pieces to the pound.)

Other aspects of this same evil, or devices for evading the provision which prohibits publications circulated at a nominal price, are the premium, the clubbing offer, and the undue extension of credit to subscribers. Each of these is often in effect only a method of refunding a portion of the subscription price. Yet it is my belief that legitimate periodicals may employ all three legitimately. In other words, they are not evil in themselves, but only become so when used for the purpose of evading the law.

Take the premium, for example. It seems to me any attempt to restrict such publishing houses as Harper & Brothers, Charles Scribner's Sons, or the Century Company from making combination offers of their various books with "Harper's," "Scribner's," or the "Century Magazine" would be extremely unjust. A premium, it seems to me, is objectionable in proportion as it makes it appear that the subscriber is receiving the periodical at a purely nominal price, or subscribes merely for the purpose of securing some object or piece of merchandise inconsistent with the nature of the publication. Thus, the Department may justly regard with suspicion a subscription list secured by promises of a piano, a kitchen stove, or a town lot, because such a contract presupposes on the part of the subscriber no initial interest in literature. But for a great book publishing house to give its periodical subscribers unusual opportunities for buying books and periodicals in combination seems to me desirable and in accord with the very spirit of the statute.

I can probably best illustrate this by our own case. It is the custom of publishers, the price of whose periodicals is ten cents a copy, to reduce that price to annual subscribers—instead of charging \$5.20 for the 52 numbers, to charge \$5.00, as do "Life" and "Ridgway's Weekly," or \$4.00, as do "Harper's" and "Leslie's Weekly." Instead of following that precedent, we give our annual subscribers the benefit of our large book manufacturing plant. This serves a double purpose. As we have a great number of subscription agents in the field, the delivery of

a book premium is a guarantee to the subscriber (whose first payment, by the way, is sometimes only a dollar) that he is dealing with our authorized representative and is guaranteed against loss; in the second place, as the premium is usually made up of the most successful features from the "Weekly" of the year before, such as our correspondence and photographs during the Russo-Japanese War, or the drawings of Remington or Frost or Gibson, or the Sherlock Holmes stories, the premium brings home to the subscribers more vividly than any words of the agent or any advertising the value he will receive in fifty-two copies of the "Weekly." The premium is really the discount for an annual subscription, not a refund in any sense of the subscription price, and by its nature it might almost be described as germane to the subscription and certainly in harmony with the spirit of the statute.

In other words, if a monthly publication whose price was fifty cents a year (assuming that such was the minimum price permitted) attempted to give a premium, I should regard it in the light of a refund to the subscriber. If a weekly publication whose price is \$1.50 chose to give the same premium, I should not object, provided always that neither the *actual* nor *advertised* value of the premium exceeded one-half the advertised price of the publication itself.

So with the clubbing offer, it would seem to me that it is entirely legitimate for a subscriber to five periodicals to receive a special rate, provided again that special rate is not such as in effect to supply him with one periodical free or at less than the minimum price prescribed by the Department.

To regulate the amount of credit extended by a publisher to his subscribers is a more difficult matter, for, as Mr. Madden suggests, it would involve a system of wholesale espionage and continual prying into a publisher's private affairs. But here, it seems to me, we might suggest a remedy for two evils at once. There is something almost despairing in Mr. Madden's description of the chameleon-like changes which take place immediately in the periodicals affected by some new ruling of the Department. This shepherd of the Post Office is shocked by the rapidity with which the wolves discard their sheep's clothing after they pass the barriers. Would it not be desirable and practicable then to

ask each publisher whose application for second-class privilege has been granted to file also at stated intervals copies of his publication, together with a circulation statement and such other information as the Department might require? This would show to what degree, if any, the character of his paper has changed, and whether the conditions which justified its admittance still obtained. I do not understand the second-class privilege to be a perpetual franchise, and it would only seem reasonable that the Post Office should have means of discovering to what extent its privileges were being abused.

In the same statement, I should provide for a declaration of the number of subscribers to whom credit was being extended, and I should rule that no more than 25 per cent of the total should be permitted to remain who had not made a payment within six months. That would keep the dead-wood from the subscription list.

The next considerable abuse of which Mr. Madden spoke was that of *sample copies*. As far as I have been able to ascertain the views of our Association, they are not greatly concerned as to the fate of sample copies. I believe they would even view with resignation their debarment from the second-class rate. But there are one or two points of policy in regard to them which it might be well to bear in mind. The evil of sample copies only becomes formidable because of the provision which permits a periodical of 1,000,000 circulation to circulate also a million copies free. And the anomaly is this, that the new publication, to which, if to any one, the sample copy is a necessity and a legitimate means of introduction to the public, is limited to the same percentage of paid circulation as its long-established competitor. If sample copies are still to be permitted, I should like to see the newcomer in journalism get an even chance; let him circulate 100 per cent of his paid circulation in sample copies the first year and 50 per cent the second year, if he likes, and hold the older periodicals down to as small a percentage as you deem right.

Nor do I believe that the publishers of our Association would oppose very vigorously the withdrawal of the privilege now accorded them of including subscription blanks in the copies

sent to expiring subscribers. This would be the means of a considerable increase in first-class postage.

Exchange copies, it seems to me, perform among periodicals a very important function, and the cost to the publisher, at least those represented in our Association, is such that he rarely exchanges without receiving some tangible return, but if the newspapers were willing to abrogate the second-class rate on their exchange, our Association would probably agree to do the same.

For the difficulties to which Mr. Madden has devoted considerable time, but which more immediately concern newspapers, Sunday and daily, such as supplements, inserts, etc., I leave it to some one better posted on newspaper affairs, such as the representatives of newspaper associations, to suggest a remedy.

Last on our list, and though not described specifically as an abuse, continually referred to as a matter to be regulated by the Department, is the amount of advertising and its percentage to reading matter.

The imposition of a tax on advertising matter has been suggested, either indirectly by limiting the relative amount of advertising, or directly by a tax in the form of extra postage on the portion of the publication containing the advertising.

Although the Periodical Publishers' Association does not wish to be understood as advocating either of the movements, its members, with a few exceptions, would not be seriously inconvenienced by a restriction of the amount of advertising to 50 per cent of the bulk of a publication, provided the average was taken for the whole year and not for a single issue. The hardship this limitation would impose on trade and technical papers, however, in which advertising is of equal importance from the readers' standpoint with the text, would seem to make its adoption by the Department unfair and unwise.

Another, and a great difficulty arises, the greatest one I see in respect to charging more for the advertising section of a periodical than for the reading matter proper. A great many periodicals would be strongly tempted under such a ruling to run disguised advertising matter, or "write-ups," and it would be a constant question for the Post Office Department to determine whether a certain article in praise of the Prudential Insurance

Company, for instance, was an advertisement or a contributed article.

It is in this connection that I desire to read an interesting colloquy between Representative Overstreet and Mr. Madden. I read from the record, page 188:

“**REPRESENTATIVE OVERSTREET:**—*Mr. Madden, if you were confronted with the necessity of making a construction upon whether a paper was published primarily for advertising purposes, would you not be obliged to take into account the proportion of the advertising to the rest of the periodical?*

“**MR. MADDEN:**—*It seems to me that would have to be done.*

“**REPRESENTATIVE OVERSTREET:**—*And if you found that proportion showed a greater percentage of purely advertising matter than of other matter, would it have, not necessarily decisive weight, but much weight, toward excluding it from the mail?*

“**MR. MADDEN:**—*It would.*”

Now I believe that any effort to restrict, or in any way to discriminate against advertising as a legitimate part of the contents of a periodical, is based upon a misconception of the fundamental act of 1879. It is fallacious to contend that this law may be interpreted in any way so as to include the standard magazines of to-day with “*regular publications designed primarily for advertising purposes.*” On March 7, 1879, Mr. A. A. Freeman, Assistant Attorney-General for the Post Office Department, rendering an opinion on the case of a publication called the *Citizen Soldier*, which opinion was immediately made a ruling by the Post Office Department, defined the issue very clearly, and showed what was in the mind of Congress.

“*A paper, the principal object or design of which is to advertise a particular trade or profession, edited and controlled by a person engaged in the particular trade or profession advertised in its columns, falls within the class defined by the law to be ‘regular publications designed primarily for advertising purposes.’ But we must not confound the desire or wish of the publisher with his ‘design.’ His wish or desire is to make money. His design is to do so by publishing a paper. He may conclude to publish a paper having no advertisements at all—such, for instance, as the New York ‘Ledger’—or he may conclude to publish one having, like the New York ‘Herald,’ a large*

amount of advertisements. In both cases, however, his business is the dissemination of newspaper matter. We buy, subscribe for, and read the 'Ledger' on account of its essays, literature, and stories. We read the 'Herald' on account of the world-wide information as to current events found in its columns, and also on account of the varied interests it advertises. Whether we look to its advertising or editorial columns, we find it full of legitimate newspaper matter. We look in vain through its columns to ascertain who its editor is or what his business is. . . . A careful examination of these papers fails to disclose that the editor of either has any other occupation than that of publishing a newspaper. The one advertises for nobody; the other for everybody. The paper under consideration pursues neither course; the burden of its editorials and general reading matter is directed in a single channel—viz., that of building up the private business of its editor. The paper is devoted to the interests of those having claims, present or prospective, against the Government, and the proprietor, and he alone, is advertised as engaged in the business of collecting these claims. . . . When we . . . ascertain that . . . the paper advertises the proprietor, and him alone, as engaged in a business enterprise, in which the particular class of persons whose interests are apparently sought to be promoted are most deeply interested, I think we may well conclude the primary or principal object of the paper is to advertise the business of the editor. . . . A paper, the primary or principal object of which is to advertise the business of a gentleman engaged in the collection of pensions or other claims against the Government, is chargeable, under the law, with precisely the same rate of postage required to be paid on a paper, the primary purpose of which is to advertise any other business or occupation."

In view of this very clear statement of the position taken by the Post Office Department when second-class matter first began to be sent through the mails, we hold that any assumption that advertising is not an essential part of a periodical, or that a magazine which carries a large amount of advertising is *de facto* a "publication designed primarily for advertising purposes," is a violation of both the spirit and the letter of a well-established principle of nearly thirty years' standing.

We would, however, protest very strongly against any discrimination in the matter of postage rate on editorial and advertising matter.

In the publishing business as it is to-day conducted, the publisher depends upon the advertising not only for his profit, but also calls upon it to make up the deficit that exists between the cost of producing a magazine and the revenue derived from the subscriber. In other words, the ten or fifteen cents that the reader pays for a periodical is not enough to pay for the art and editorial matter that goes into that publication: it is partly paid for out of the advertising revenue. Therefore, on whom will the tax on the advertising or a limitation of the advertising fall? On the purchaser of the magazine?

Such a tax must necessarily result in a deterioration in the quantity or quality of the editorial matter. Without the assistance of the advertiser, it would be absolutely impossible to give the public anything like the quantity or quality of reading matter that it now enjoys. This vast amount of education and entertainment will suffer exactly in proportion to the restriction put on advertising. We do not think that the reading public will stand for any deterioration in the quantity or quality of the art and editorial matter now offered them by the great American periodicals.

Moreover, may not the reading public itself be entrusted with the regulation of this matter of percentage of advertising? Any regulation made by the Post Office Department would concern itself with quantity only. The regulation could not take into consideration the relation between the *quantity* of advertising and the *quality* of the reading matter. The reading public does take into consideration these two all-important elements—namely, quantity of reading and quality of reading. The publisher who offends in this matter soon hears from the reading public in the shape of diminished circulation, and this chastisement, above any other, will keep him in the straight and narrow path.

While the tentative suggestions made by me in respect of sample copies, minimum price and weight, annual statement of circulation and limitation of credit, premiums, clubbing offers, exchanges, and the right to enclose subscription blanks have not

been passed upon by the Association formally as a whole, and consequently are not presented in any definitive way, I have given the general sense of the replies received by me in a letter sent to every member of the Association. If you so desire, I can give you a synopsis showing the divergence of individual views, but I have said enough to indicate in a general way the Association's attitude toward these abuses and the direction in which they would suggest that Mr. Madden look for relief.

I have here a list of the questions propounded in that letter of which I am speaking and a record of the answers—that is, in the affirmative, the negative, or doubtful. Do you want me to read that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:—What is the pleasure of the Commission?

REPRESENTATIVE OVERSTREET:—Mr. Collier might file it?

SENATOR CARTER:—I suggest that it be filed and made a part of the record.*

MR. COLLIER:—Now, gentlemen, I submit that with the encouragement of finding the Department's rulings sustained almost without exception by the courts; with the satisfaction of seeing evils at least as great as those which now confront him, such as the book abuse, entirely extirpated; with the co-operation of the publishers of legitimate newspapers and legitimate periodicals toward the correction of abuses, Mr. Madden should hesitate to recommend to this Commission any program based on incorrect assumptions or inconclusive figures. From him we should expect a series of definite suggestions, based on experience and supported by statistics, for the gradual improvement of the second-class service, and proceeding, step by step, with the cold logic of a mathematical demonstration.

We are the more encouraged to expect a fair statement from Mr. Madden for the reason that, at the beginning of his brief, he expressly disclaims any intention of urging upon this Commission a change of the policy enacted into law by Congress. His statement (I read from the minutes, page 7) is as follows:

“It is not my intention to argue as to policy, or to discuss any of the numerous theories concerning the subject. I shall make a plain, unvarnished statement of the present situation and

* See page 31

nothing more. It will be to the point and as brief as may be consistent with the importance of the matter to be presented.

“The Department will content itself with showing that the laws are defective, and wherein they are so, and their effect upon the service. This Commission and Congress can determine the questions of policy. Should it be your judgment or that of Congress that, notwithstanding the conditions, the Department should proceed to execute the laws as best it can, that course will be followed. But a solution of this great postal problem, which now so vexes the publishers, the service, and the Administration, and is the cause of such tremendous wrongs, is hoped for.”

But Mr. Madden, after awakening our sympathy by his evident impartiality and by his eloquent portrayal of the difficulties wherewith his Department is encompassed, when we look to him for a scientific analysis of the factors in this problem, falls back on foggy generalizations such as these (I read from the record, page 195) :

“MR. GLASGOW:—I understand that perfectly well, and I am trying to get information. I understand you think there should be no difficulties of classification. What I want to understand is why you fix four cents as the rate, instead of two or one or three or six or seven or ten? What is the reason that induces you to put it at four?”

“MR. MADDEN:—Because I believe that would fairly compensate the Government for the handling of the matter, and asking no questions as to whether it is primarily designed for advertising, or whether it has subscribers, or whether it is educational, or whatever it is.

“MR. GLASGOW:—Is that a guess?”

“MR. MADDEN:—Yes, a good deal of a guess.

“MR. GLASGOW:—Is that based on any calculations you have or any figures? I want to get some definite information that will enable us to know where we stand.

“MR. MADDEN:—That is based on calculations, yes; but the basis for the calculation I can not give you now, because it was made some time ago, and I do not have it in mind.

“MR. GREEN:—Was it not your basis at that time that increasing the rate to four cents a pound would cover the deficit

at the time you made that estimate, which was about a year ago, was it not?

“MR. MADDEN:—No, sir, it was a long time ago.

“MR. GREEN:—I think the statement was that if the rate had been four cents it would have quadrupled the income on second-class, and it would have about covered the deficit.

“MR. MADDEN:—I think it was something of that kind.

“MR. GLASGOW:—Is it your idea that the four cents will cover the deficit or that the four cents is the cost of the Government?

“MR. MADDEN:—It is pretty nearly approximately the cost. Our figures are probably high because we can not get exactly at the true cost. That is the difficulty.”

That is the difficulty.

And Mr. Hubbard, called from Chicago to corroborate his chief, testifies luminously his method of arriving at the cost. I read from the record, page 257:

“REPRESENTATIVE MOON:—What was your data on the loss on second-class?

“MR. HUBBARD:—The figure that I put, the cost of carrying second-class, handling, and delivering, is four cents a pound. That is, I assume it to be that.

“REPRESENTATIVE MOON:—That is just an assumption?

“MR. HUBBARD:—An assumption.

“REPRESENTATIVE MOON:—Do you know whether that is a correct figure or not?

“MR. HUBBARD:—I do not know whether it is four, six, or seven.”

Yet, after professing unwillingness to advise this Commission on the broad question of policy, and confessing his inability to substantiate his statements by figures, what does this zealous and soft-spoken representative of the Post Office Department, who has so consistently left out the question of policy, recommend?

Not the fearless continuation of a program of rigid enforcement to which he has pointed with just pride, and in which the courts have almost without exception sustained the Department's view.

Not the increase of the executive staff and an additional

appropriation of as many hundred thousand dollars as may be necessary for the prosecution of offenders, who, by his own account, are securing unmerited privileges at a loss of millions annually to the Government.

Not the appointment of a permanent Postal Commission to relieve the Postmaster-General of the embarrassment of making adverse decisions, which are attended, in Mr. Madden's own words, "*by personal hazard to the executive.*"

Not even the strengthening of the present statute in the places where a series of test cases would show it to be weak, so that the abuses now complained of might be explicitly legislated out of being.

No, Mr. Madden will have none of these. What he wants is a statute that will deal with newspapers, periodicals, catalogues, advertising pamphlets, write-ups, mail order journals, stock quotation sheets, illuminated Biblical texts, all the exhibits he has shown us, and a thousand yet to come, as the railroads deal with coal—bulk them all as "printed matter" and charge a flat rate—a self-sustaining rate according to what he admits to be a guess of four or five cents a pound.

Mr. Madden, the man who has been fighting these abuses all his official life, the champion of the legitimate as against those spurious periodicals of the second-class, the enemy of those who masquerade under pretense of being newspapers, now proposes to abandon the fight, to lower his colors, to legitimize the very abuses he has denounced, to surrender to the authors of these subterfuges the rights given by Congress to honorable publishers, who have kept faith with the public.

That this is no exaggeration of the interesting and radical suggestions made by Mr. Madden is evidenced by his reply to a question by Mr. Glasgow. I read from the record, page 154:

"MR. GLASGOW:—*Can you tell us how you would get to that?*

"MR. MADDEN:—*Yes; a uniform rate for all printed matter.*

"MR. KRACKWNWIZER:—*So that there is no classification at all?*

"MR. MADDEN:—*No classification except letters, printed matter, and merchandise.*

"MR. GLASGOW:—*Then you would eliminate the policy upon which the second class was established?*

“MR. MADDEN:—You can not carry out the policy. I have made it plain that you can not.”

It seems incredible to me, gentlemen of this Commission, that Mr. Madden should not see the lack of logic and the lack of courage involved in his position. Because one Postmaster-General after another has lacked courage to enforce the law, because thousands of unworthy periodicals have usurped our rights and flooded the country with cheap competition under cloak of the second-class privilege, are we honest publishers, who have dealt fairly with the people and with the Department, to be made to pay the penalty?

The periodical literature of America is something of which we may well be proud. Its growth has been a part of our national history; its influence may be felt behind some of the most significant movements in our national life. It has reached its present high prestige among the periodical producing nations of the world by virtue of three favoring conditions:

1. The foresight and public spirit of Congress in creating the second-class rate for newspapers and periodicals.

2. The loyalty of publishers of legitimate newspapers and periodicals in executing what they conceived to be a trust imposed on them by Congress for the benefit of the reading public.

3. The development of such cooperation between publisher and advertiser as assures the reader the benefit of added revenue.

What would be the effect of Mr. Madden's recommendation that all printed matter, whether it be periodical literature of the character of "Harper's Magazine" or commercial catalogues and pamphlets, shall be charged for by the Government at a rate of four or five cents a pound, as railroads charge for coal or iron? I wonder if Mr. Madden has considered what the effect would be? Would it not be, first of all, to open the flood gates of the second class to those whom Mr. Madden has been trying to keep out, or has succeeded in keeping out? Would not all printed matter now sent at third-class rates immediately take advantage of the new dispensation, and has Mr. Madden figured what effect upon the postal revenues that would have? Would not the publisher, to meet the new condition, be compelled to do one of three unwelcome things, raise the price of his periodical, or lower its quality, or lose double what he now loses per copy, and would

not this infallibly result in diminishing circulation, increasing the cost, and eventually converting what is now a great educative agency among the whole people into one more class luxury for the few?

Would not finally those advertisers who have formerly gone into the homes of America in company with the best contemporary art and literature (and helped, as Mr. Walter Page said in an address he made some two years ago, to subsidize literature and art in America), when they found the circulation of magazines shrinking, when they found that only the rich could afford the periodical that had now become a luxury, would they not withdraw their support from these periodicals, establish house organs of their own, and remove the last prop from beneath the tottering fabric of American periodical literature?

I do not believe that picture of the consequences of overturning the policy of Congress is painted in too sombre colors. The only gleam of humor I find in the revolutionary program of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General is his answer to the following question by Representative Overstreet:

"Then have you not found it difficult of enforcing this law, lest a too strict enforcement would so overwhelmingly disturb existing conditions, that it would be much better to have a statute making plain the administration, rather than limiting it to individual cases?"

To which Mr. Madden replied:

"I am very glad you express it that way, Mr. Overstreet; that is what I have been trying to say, but I have not been able to say it as well as you put it."

"So overwhelmingly disturb existing conditions," indeed! In other words, rather than disturb the perpetrators of the very subterfuge and abuses he has been denouncing, Mr. Madden proposes to shake the entire legitimate publishing industry of America to its foundations. No wonder, in his gratitude, he exclaims to Mr. Overstreet: *"Thank you for understanding me."*

To be entirely frank, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that Mr. Madden saw clearly in his own mind the consequences of what he was proposing. I believe his enthusiasm carried him off his feet.

The only shadow of a reason for this proposition to upheave

the foundation on which the publishing industry in America has been built up is the detestation in which every American rightly holds the word "subsidy." There is something un-American about that word, and I am tired, and every honest publisher of a legitimate newspaper or periodical is tired, of hearing it applied to our business, as if we had grown fat on governmental favor, as has many a sleek beneficiary of the rebate and the tariff. If I thought my business or my paper depended for its success on a subsidy, I should be ashamed to come here and beg for its continuance. If there is one word a degree more detestable to me than "subsidy," that word is *cant*, and the composite picture that has been painted to this Commission of the American publisher is of a creature who endeavors to cloak private greed under the mantle of public service. Now, gentlemen, we publishers may not be any better than we should be; we may call one another hard names at times, and the newspaper proprietor may accuse the magazine editor of muck-raking when he calls attention to the patent medicine and bunco mine advertisements in his friend's daily, but when it comes down to dealing with the public, both classes of publishers are doing good clean work for the citizenship of this Republic—work done without any thought of or reliance on "subsidies." And it is just here that the sharp line must be drawn between the press of America, considered as a mere physical thing (as coal or iron or flour or fertilizer), as Mr. Madden would have us consider it, and as a great and responsible engine of public opinion, which is how Congress regarded it in 1879. When Mr. Green, vice-president and chairman of the National Executive Committee of the United Typothetæ of America, appeared before this Commission in favor of a flat rate for all printed matter, he said:

"We claim that all mail matter receiving the same service should be charged the same price. Those using the mails, whether publishers of daily newspapers, weeklies, monthly magazines, mail order papers, house organs, or catalogues, are in business as a rule primarily for profit, and not from any disinterested desire to disseminate knowledge or to benefit mankind in general."

To which I reply that though they are not like a certain

distinguished industrial philanthropist from New Jersey, and do not proclaim their love for mankind from the housetops, I would back Charles Scribner of "Scribner's Magazine," Sam McClure of "McClure's Magazine," Albert Shaw of the "Review of Reviews," George Harvey of "Harper's Magazine" and the "North American Review," Cyrus Curtis of the "Ladies' Home Journal" and the "Saturday Evening Post," Frank Doubleday of the "World's Work," and William B. Howland of the "Outlook" to sell every copy of their magazines at a loss for ten years, rather than print a line that would break faith with their duty to the American public. That is how their periodicals, and that is how the great newspapers of the century, have won the confidence of the people. It is not because it would cost me more to mail "Collier's Weekly" that I oppose this unworthy suggestion of Mr. Madden's; it is because in breaking faith with me you compel me to break faith with my readers and deprive them of the things they have a right to expect from me, and which I can not give them if you are going to let down the bars that separate "Collier's" from a shoe catalogue. I have no desire to push myself forward into the company of the good men whom I have mentioned, but when I entered journalism it was in the hope that I might enter a field of honorable public service, as they had done, and make my mark as they did. I should have made another choice, and so will the young men of to-morrow, if you hold forth no other incentive than that of competing with Mr. Green in the field of commercial printing.

Now we come, gentlemen, to what I consider the most important phase of this whole question of second-class matter. The impression has gone abroad—and no doubt the form in which the announcement of the Commission was made is partially responsible for it—that the postal deficit is at the bottom of this inquiry. I read from the announcement:

"The report of the Postmaster-General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905, shows that the cost of maintaining the entire Postal Service for that year was approximately \$167,000,000, and that the revenue from all sources was approximately \$153,000,000."

Then it goes on to speak of the cost of second-class matter.

It was, therefore, with great pleasure I read the clear-cut statement of Mr. Overstreet on that point when he said:

“Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time that some question or answer has appeared to give the impression that the deficit has something to do with this investigation, or this investigation something to do with the deficit. I think it is well enough, in view of that, to state at least my understanding of the appearance of this Commission. I do not understand that the question of the deficit has anything to do with the inquiry of this Commission, nor whether there is any deficit or not. That is a matter of bookkeeping.”

This statement is so uncompromisingly clear that I hesitate to mention the word “*deficit*” before this Commission. Had Mr. Madden confined his recommendations, therefore, to suggestions for the correction of those abuses he has described, I should have been content to consider, with Mr. Overstreet, that the question before this Commission was localized to purely one of departmental efficiency. But when Mr. Madden oversteps the boundary that separates a departmental question from a question of public policy, when he presumes to tell this Commission that a policy which has been in force for a quarter of a century should be now reversed, without supporting it by intelligent statistics, I think that to discuss this amazing proposition intelligently with the American people we shall be *compelled* to discuss the postal deficit.

If it is seriously proposed that the great periodicals of America shall be classed by Mr. Madden as the railroads class sacks of flour or tons of coal, if the taxpayer is to be told that the newspaper and periodical publishers of America are imposing a burden upon his shoulders instead of doing him a service, then it becomes our duty, in self-defense, to place the responsibility for the postal deficit where it belongs. If the scope of this inquiry is as broad as the announcement would seem to indicate, we can not escape considering the interrelated problems of railway pay and the cost of carrying second-class matter.

If the second-class privilege is responsible for a deficit of from fourteen to twenty million dollars a year, it is responsible to just that extent for an impairment of the efficiency of every other branch of the postal service. If, *per contra*, the rate of

railway pay is excessive, then second-class matter and the rural free delivery service are being held unjustly to account for sins that are not theirs. However you state the problem, you can not diminish the revenue of the Department as a whole without diminishing the efficiency of each particular branch, or increase the revenue of the whole without increasing the efficiency of each particular branch.

Now, so far from making any pretense to special information on the subject of whether the railroads are paid too much for carrying the mails or not, or whether the franking privilege—now extended so indiscriminately—should be charged to each department of the Government, or whether the expenses of the rural free delivery system are out of proportion to those involved in carrying second-class mail, I expressly disclaim any particular knowledge on each and all of these subjects.

There have been many statistics laid before this Commission with the object of throwing light on the cost of carrying and handling second-class mail. The record shows that Senator Carter and Representative Overstreet have been indefatigable in quest of information on that subject. From fellow members of the Periodical Publishers' Association I have been deluged with theories for proving that the cost of equipment of railway mail cars was disproportionately estimated as between first and second class, that railway and express companies within certain zones of distribution would carry periodicals at less than half the rate charged by the Government, that the average haul on second-class matter was shorter than that on first-class matter, that the routing of from 75 to 90 per cent of the second-class mail by publishers had largely diminished the cost of handling. These theories may be correct or not, and the conclusions deduced from them may be favorable to our contention that second-class mail is indirectly self-sustaining to-day and will be directly self-sustaining to-morrow—or they may, on the contrary, sustain the cheerful "guesses," and the "estimates" and "approximations," of Mr. Madden. My position in any case is the same.

Before you change the rate on second-class matter, before you reverse the policy on which the periodical publishing business of this country has been built up, the Post Office Department will have to show the people themselves, and show it so

clearly that there can be no doubt, what the cost of carrying second-class matter is, and what it should be, what the loss on second-class matter is and what it should be if the abuses were corrected and the Department administered on a business basis. Then, when the issue is set plainly before them, we will discover whether they will tolerate having their reading matter taken from them. For if it is proposed to deprive the newspaper and periodical press of America of the second-class privilege, which for twenty-five years it has used for the benefit of the public, on the mere guess of an overzealous Third Assistant Postmaster-General, then every taxpayer in America will be asked daily and weekly and monthly which of these three courses he will choose:

“Do you want your money paid to the railroads at excessive rates for transporting the mails, or do you want it expended by your Congressman in sending out free seeds and free speeches, or do you want it expended in sending you at cost or below cost the news and art and literature of the world?”

Some of the members of our Association have compiled at considerable trouble the figures of their average haul, and these figures are at the service of your Commission.** I fear, however, that they throw little real light on the problem as a whole because they represent only fifteen of the thirty thousand or forty thousand papers receiving the second-class privilege. They are also all periodicals of immense national circulation published from New York, and their average haul is probably almost double that of the bulk of second-class publications.

There is a little sidelight on this question of average haul however, that may illuminate the question from an angle the reverse of statistical. During a recent shooting trip in Wyoming, I was caught at dusk many miles from camp in a snowstorm. Eventually we reached a ranch where we found shelter. Round the lamp after supper was a little group listening to the twelve-year-old son of our host, the ranchman, reading aloud from the October number of “Scribner’s” an article by Thompson Seton on “The Great American Bison,” reciting among other interesting facts of American history how the buffalo herds of a hundred years ago had mapped out by their trails the great railway sys-

** See page 32

tems of to-day. This was in Jackson's Hole, Wyoming, some four days' ride from the nearest railroad, and the haul on that copy of "Scribner's" must have been a thousand miles over the average. Yet who shall say the extra cost to the Department was not well spent in educating that little future citizen of this Republic?

So in Canyon Creek, half-way across the Teton Pass, I found an old cattleman fondly absorbed in "Mr. Dooley on the Power of the Press," though that copy must have raised the average haul of the "American Magazine" in a way that would make Mr. Madden's blood run cold; and in Jackson itself, two days' ride from the railroad, Mr. Deloney, the leading citizen, who keeps the general store and is building a little brick church for his townfolk, told me, when I offered to send him "Collier's" free, that he already subscribed, and a few months before had emptied his shelves of his whole stock of patent medicines because of some articles we had published. Who shall say then, Mr. Madden, when you are computing the average haul, what forces of civilization, what fibres at work knitting together a new national citizenship, you are measuring with your little yardstick?

To sum up the views of the Periodical Publishers' Association briefly, then:

They believe there are grave abuses of the second-class privilege to be remedied.

They are now and have always been willing to cooperate with the Department as far as is consistent with a maintenance of their own rights under the law.

They are willing to meet Mr. Madden along the lines I have indicated to suggest more specific regulations for the government of periodicals in respect to:

Sample copies, exchanges, minimum price, number of pieces to the pound, premiums, clubbing offers, extension of credit, enclosing of subscription and renewal blanks.

Should these regulations prove ineffective, they favor the appointment of a permanent Postal Commission.

So much on the side of concession and cooperation.

On the other hand, they are unanimously and unalterably opposed to a change of the second-class rate, no matter how slight, for the following reasons:

1. As being against public policy, for if there was ever a

time when this country needed an untrammelled press, actuated by partly idealistic rather than wholly commercial motives, it is to-day.

2. On the ground that other postal reforms and retrenchments already too long postponed will place the Department on a self-supporting basis.

3. On the ground that no figures of cost of carrying or cost of handling second-class matter have been adduced before this Commission on which any intelligent business man would feel warranted in taking any action whatever.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, let me say one word, not as the representative of the Periodical Publishers' Association, not as an individual publisher, but as a citizen and taxpayer. Apart from any consideration of the economic questions involved in this inquiry, I believe that the situation of America to-day is such that every influence of the honest newspaper and periodical press is needed to help us keep our national balance, as between the great and growing power of concentrated capital on the one hand, and the dangerous elements of discontent on the other. We have a great tide of illiterate immigration sweeping in on us on which unscrupulous demagogues and labor leaders are anxious to ride to power; we have also private fortunes of unprecedented proportions and corporations of many millions capital seeking to crush competition and still further exploit the necessities of the people. Between these great opposing forces, presaging a social ferment the like of which America has never seen, stands a loyal, sane, fearless, and disinterested press. It is for you to say whether that press shall continue its work for civilization and good citizenship or whether, through a blow struck by this Commission at the foundations of its relations with the reading public, it shall sink to a subordinate position in the ranks of commercial industry.

* The matter referred to is as follows:

On September 29th I addressed to every member of our Association a letter in which the subjoined questions were propounded. To this letter I received eighteen replies from the following publishers:

"The Ladies' World," "Suburban Life," Judge Company, Harper & Brothers ("Harper's Magazine," "Harper's Weekly," "Harper's Bazar"), "The Christian Endeavor World," the Ridgway Company ("Everybody's Magazine," "Ridgway's Weekly"), Doubleday, Page & Company ("World's Work," "Country Life in America," "Garden Magazine"), "The House-keeper," "The Etude," "Pearson's," "System," "American Monthly Review of Reviews," The Religious Press Association, D. Appleton & Company, "Success Magazine," "Little Folks," Funk & Wagnalls Company ("The Literary Digest"), Robert Grier Cooke ("The Burlington Magazine").

The first question was:

SAMPLE COPIES:—Would the Association oppose a law permitting a publisher to mail sample copies equal to 100 per cent of his paid circulation at any time during the first year of a publication, provided its circulation do not exceed 100,000, and 50 per cent the second year with the same proviso, and limiting him to 25 per cent for all succeeding years?

To this I received one reply in the affirmative, fourteen replies in the negative, and three replies doubtful.

The second question was:

Would the Association oppose placing a minimum price of fifty cents a year on weeklies and twenty-five cents a year on monthlies?

To this I received three replies in the affirmative and fifteen replies in the negative.

The third question was:

Would the Association oppose a regulation providing for a minimum weight of five copies to the pound?

To this I received one reply in the affirmative, thirteen replies in the negative, and four replies doubtful.

The fourth question was:

Would they be willing to admit an arbitrary limit to advertising of 50 per cent?

To this I received eight replies in the affirmative, six replies in the negative, and four replies doubtful.

The fifth question was:

Would three months' free continuance of a subscription after expiration be sufficient?

To this I received thirteen replies in the affirmative, three replies in the negative, and two replies doubtful.

The sixth question was:

Would the publishers in the Association be willing, if the present rate be maintained, to file each year a sworn statement of circulation paid, free, sample, exchange, etc., with the Post Office Department?

To this I received fifteen replies in the affirmative and three replies in the negative.

* * AVERAGE HAUL

(As Reported Nov. 19)

	Average Haul	Approximate Circulation	
Collier's.	959	600,000	575,400,000
Pearson's.	891.25	250,000	222,812,500
Century.	699	150,000	104,850,000
World's Work	781	80,000	191,345,000
Country Life in America		100,000	
The Garden Magazine..		30,000	
Farming.		35,000	
Christian Herald.....	834	250,000	208,500,000
Outing.	823	73,000	60,079,000
Ladies' Home Journal..	864	1,090,000	941,760,000
Churchman.	460	20,000	9,200,000
Literary Digest.....	995.5	122,000	121,451,000
McClure's.	960.32	414,000	397,572,480
Current Literature.....	912	23,000	20,976,000
Independent.	885	70,000	61,950,000
The Ladies' World....	680	450,000	306,000,000
Everybody's.	924	600,000	554,400,000
The American Magazine	1,025	300,000	307,500,000
		<hr/> 4,657,000	<hr/> 4,083,795,980

Average 876.91



